

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending; Claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 are amended; and no claims are canceled herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1 was objected to; Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 2001/0006461 to Okuno in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,029 to Kurihara et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,538,710 to Jang; and Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okuno in view of Kurihara and Jang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,773,127 to Kao.

With regard to the objection to Claim 1, the noted informality has been addressed by the present amendment. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Okuno in view of Kurihara and Jang, and the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okuno in view of Kurihara and Jang and further in view of Kao, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites in part, a width formed by a front edge of an upper edge portion and an incident light surface of one side of the area light conversion member interposed between the upper and lower edge portions of the reflector, is larger than a gap defined between the frame and the other side of the area light conversion member.

According to the claimed configuration, since the width measured from the incident light surface to the edge of the upper edge portion of the lamp reflector interposing the light guide together with the lower edge portion, is said to be larger than the gap provided between

the opposite edge of the light guide received in the frame 32 and the up-right surface of the step portion along the thickness direction of the light guide, the light guide is not disengaged from the lamp reflector even though the light guide is the farthest away from the cathode tube because the light guide is repeatedly thermally expanded and shrunk.

As acknowledged in the outstanding Office Action at page 3, Okuno does not disclose or suggest or compare the width of one side of the light conversion member between the upper and lower edge portions of the reflector to a gap defined between the frame and the other side of the area light conversion member, as recited in Claim 1. However, the Office Action asserts that Jang makes up for the deficiencies of Okuno discussed above. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is respectfully submitted that Jang fails to disclose or suggest the features identified above as deficient in Okuno. Specifically, Jang merely discloses a light guide 12, a light source 15 and an enclosure for holding the light guide that includes a supporting member 14 and a frame 13 surrounding a portion of the light guide 12. A gap 20 is defined between connecting portion 13 and the light guide 12. Please see Figure 4a of Jang.

In contrast, independent Claim 1 recites that a width formed by a front edge of the upper edge portion and the incident light surface of one side of the area light conversion member interposed between the upper and lower edge portions of the reflector is larger than a gap defined between the frame and the other side of the area light conversion member. There is no teaching, disclosure or even suggestion in the applied art, nor does not the Office Action particularly assert as such, that the features of the width as compared to the size of a gap as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, as neither Okuno nor Jang, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of Claim 1 discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-5, 7 and 8

patentably distinguish over Okuno, Kurihara and Jang. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.


As for the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okuno, Kurihara, Jang and Kao, Claim 6 depends from amended Claim 1. As noted above, the combination of Okuno and Jang fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent Claim 1. Because Kao is not relied upon to disclose the features identified as deficient in the applied combination of Okuno and Jang, Kao is not substantially addressed herewith.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis in the teachings of any of Okuno, Kurihara, Jang, and Kao to support the applied combination. Certainly, the outstanding Office Action fails to cite any specific teachings within any of the references to provide motivation for the combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Okuno, Kurihara, Jang, and Kao is a result of hindsight reconstruction in view of the present specification, and is improper.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and the present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

EHK/KMM/law

I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\247515\AMDT DUE 6DEC05.DOC